

A lot of people considered in poverty I don't think we would consider in poverty. They maybe have an air-conditioned apartment. They may have iPhones. They may have cars. But you are considered in poverty if you are not earning a great deal of money. And the bag of things you are getting can, in many cases, exceed that of what a working parent, frequently a father, in the home can provide.

The government says provided you don't get married to a guy with an income or much of an income, we are going to give you a free apartment, frequently a nicer apartment than people who are not in the system yet. We are going to give you free food.

When I talk to the clerks at the grocery stores and such, they frequently say the food one gets is more expensive than the clerks who work at the grocery stores can afford.

When you give free healthcare, when you give additional checks of some basis, TANF checks, you can quickly wind up in a situation in which, like I said, you are better off financially not getting married.

This was, I think, the biggest policy mistake we have seen in America, perhaps in hundreds of years, the decision in the 1960s to, in essence, have the government replace the husband.

I think so many of the problems in America today, including the crime problems that we addressed or tried to address in the gun bills that were passed earlier today, actually wouldn't be anywhere near the problem they are had we not done what we could to destroy the American family as Karl Marx wanted.

It is the bag of things one gets. Efforts have been made throughout the last year and a half, some successful, some not, to push more and more money in the system for people or for single parents—could be a man, could be a woman—who are not married to someone with much of an income, the efforts made to increase the earned income tax credit, the increases in the food stamps, the efforts made to put more low-income housing out there.

I remember, too, as I mentioned, I talked to some of the admittedly more liberal people who administer the low-

income housing. I asked them: What about the program don't you like?

Well, it is a good program I am glad to be part of here, but these people are getting nicer housing than I am getting.

It kind of reminds me like when you talk to the clerk at the grocery store. The people in the system are getting nicer groceries than the people not. The people getting the low-income housing, once they get off the waiting list, are sometimes getting better accommodations than people who are off on their own, particularly couples starting out.

In any event, I think if there is one thing I would like to have the Republican Party do, if we ever do get both Houses and the Presidency again, is to make a concerted effort to change these welfare programs so never again will the United States be in the business of encouraging families without both parents, particularly encouraging families without a father at home.

The results of Lyndon Johnson's policies have been written about for 50 years now. Whether we are talking about Daniel Moynihan or George Gilder or Robert Rector, everybody points it out.

This breakdown in the family, which everybody knows is ruining America or is largely responsible for causing the moral decline in America, it didn't just happen. It happened because the U.S. Government and people in this body wanted to take money and give it to people living a certain lifestyle and take it from the tax dollars of people living the nuclear family lifestyle.

I strongly encourage people in this body, including Republican leadership, if we take control of this House 2 years from now with the Presidency, to make their number one priority flipping around these welfare programs which have done so much to lead to the moral decline that we have in America today.

I realize it means standing up to the media. It is standing up to—a former Democrat mayor of Milwaukee used to refer to the poverty pimps. I don't know whether they use that word anymore.

It will take standing up to the poverty pimps and finally getting the

strength of the American family back where it was in the 1960s, back where it was in the 1950s where our schools seemed to be doing a better job, where it didn't seem like the crime was anywhere near as great as today.

By the way, things like the murder rate should be falling precipitously because of improved medical care, but we still have a higher murder rate today, last year, than we did in the fifties, which is just preposterous but one of the effects of Lyndon Johnson's war on the family.

I leave that goal for both the Republicans and Democrats, to stop and think what they can do to get the American family back where it was 60 years ago.

Those are some of what I consider the major issues in America, issues that should be talked about today and are, quite frankly, of more significance than some of the things that the media talks about.

I hope when we get done taking our break near the end of June that we do something to address the border, or President Biden would address it immediately, that we do something to address the huge number of drug overdoses and all the broken hearts out there of the people who died because of this problem.

I hope we begin to address the breakdown of the family that didn't just happen. It happened almost by design of the government. I hope we do something about the excessive spending, which results in this inflation that makes it difficult for people at all ages of life. But I think it must make it so difficult for the youngest people as they look forward: Can we buy a home? Can we have children?

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 11(b) of House Resolution 188, the House stands adjourned until 9 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon (at 9 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 9, 2022, at 9 a.m.

BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF PAYGO LEGISLATION

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YAR-

MUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, the attached estimate of the costs of H.R. 7776, the Water Resources Development Act of 2022, as

ESTIMATE OF PAY-AS-YOU-GO EFFECTS FOR H.R. 7776

amended, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

	By fiscal year, in millions of dollars—												
	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2022- 2027	2022- 2032
Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Impact .....	0	748	0	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	-748	747	-1

Components may not sum to totals because of rounding.